

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT**

Friday 12 August 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 12 August 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110812-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
GNSO

Avri Doria - NC
Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

At-Large:

Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO
Olivier Cr pin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff
Seth Greene
Wendy Profit
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Karla Valente – ICANN Staff
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG co-chair
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO
Alain Berranger - Individual
Michele Neylon - RrSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
John Rahman Kahn - Individual
Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large
Elaine Pruis - Minds and Machines
Andrew Mack - CBUC
Krista Papac – RrSG
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large
Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you Sabah. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 12th of August. And on this call we have Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alex Gakuru, Carlos Aguirre, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eric Brunner-Williams. And for staff we have Seth Green, Wendy Profit and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

We have apologies from Avri Doria, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Evan Leibovitch, probably Cintra Sooknanan because we can't get through to her and John Rahman Khan. And is there anybody that I have perhaps left off? Would you please say your name before you speak for transcription purposes?

And thank you, Carlton, over to you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Glen. Hi everyone. Welcome to the JAS call for today, Friday, 12th August. Good to see all of you. You see the agenda; it's on the bottom left corner of the Adobe page. But as you would say we are going to substantively look at the nonfinancial support section of the draft final report.

It's just to remind everyone if you have outstanding SOIs please do make sure they are posted to staff; that would be most helpful.

I would want to note at the top here another piece of housekeeping item. We are really trying very hard to tie down the report in a way that we can say that we are all agreed or disagreed on some points of view.

And the plan is that we will go through the report areas, we'll ask if there is consensus on the content. And we will note any differences that will come up. Members still have an opportunity to make comments on the content. And we would really like you to make the comments on the wiki pages; the wiki pages have been set up. It's been circulated.

And the idea here is very straightforward. The comments that are made on the wiki page is easier to track for the persons who are preparing the final report. And the principal (former) for the final report is our Seth Green. And it really is very helpful to Seth - he's a very diligent fellow - if he could see all of the comments in one place; it really does help. And I'm asking you again please do so.

When we make - put the content to the list and ask for comments again it really is just to capture and push everyone. But please, please, please make your comments on the wiki, set up for comments against the final report, it's posted. And it's right there in the notes section of the Adobe Connect room, it's posted on the list. It really does help in having a report that we can all agree finalized.

That said let's move into the meat of this - today's call. It's in the notes section of the Adobe Connect room. In kind support, you notice we have changed the wording there to nonfinancial support. For those of you who can't see the Adobe Connect it's Pages 19-23 of the draft final

report. The draft final report is also on the wiki in three different formats. So let's look at it.

By the way the - Elaine Pruis was the lead on this area of the report. Is Elaine on the call? I don't see here in the Adobe Connect.

Glen de Saint G ry: No she's not on the call as far as I know.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Glen. In any rate this part of the report we want to identify and enumerate as far as possible the kinds of nonfinancial support that qualified support applicants could look for. And there is a list of them there that is noted.

Remember this is not supposed to be a finite list, it's an inclusive list. Some things are there because we thought it was important to have those enumerated. So if you just look at that list starting with the following types of in kind support; that will be changed to nonfinancial support in the final-final report.

Alan, you - your hand is up; you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just a question for clarification. We talked a fair amount about what - how discounts are treated. I presume based on this new definition we're not treating a discount as nonfinancial support, as in kind support. Will it be showing up under financial support or are we not including that at all?

Carlton Samuels: No my understanding - Alan, that's a good question - is that discounts is going to be on the financial support.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's my understanding.

Alan Greenberg: So - okay thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Carlton, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I understand the rationale in the change (unintelligible) but I wonder if at some point in perhaps the first time we use the category and the definition (unintelligible) financial and nonfinancial if we could, or in a glossary or somewhere, still link back to what is traditionally used in many places and spaces, the fact that in kind and nonfinancial support are what we're talking about here.

The reason I'm asking for that is in a number of particularly grant scheme and governments or (unintelligible) provided support mechanisms where one has to provide audits and reporting and feedback. The terms in kind support are very commonly used.

And it might be of some use to come from that background and who may indeed be seeking to get financial or nonfinancial support from those same spaces if they could show documentation that we're all talking about the same thing. Because of course the provision of nonfinancial support has a financial burden to someone, somewhere, somehow. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. I think it would be useful for us to make that clarification. I don't see anything at all challenging in making it clear

here that nonfinancial support might actually involve some money passing between some person involved in the chain. I think it's useful to do it here.

We had discussed that at length on the list. I'm looking to see if it was noted here because I can remember Elaine actually acknowledging that this possibility existed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Carlton, just in light in one of the things you said. It's not just a matter of money it's a matter of cost.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, cost.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I mean,, you know, the pro bono provisions of something for example, you know, costing time, costing staff costs, costing administration, costing things (unintelligible) utilities to provide that service (unintelligible) to someone else is traditionally shown somewhere in the books.

I'm not saying that you should change it from the financial to nonfinancial or nonfinancial to financial in that criteria. But I think just having it listed somewhere that says, you know, we can't (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. It was around the time when we had the conversation about pro bono, what was the meaning of pro bono; you're quite right, I remember that.

But Alan, you have your hand up. And, Eric, can you be prepared to say a little bit about what you placed in the chat there? I think members might want to hear it.

Alan, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. Alan Greenberg. Yes, I want to make sure we're not getting back into the discussion of what should be financial, what should be nonfinancial. You know, clearly if I donate cans of cranberry jelly to the Christmas basket program here I have to buy them but I'm giving in kind support, I'm giving in kind support.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: The problem is that as Cheryl pointed out the terms are used differently in different places. We just want to make sure that we're covering all sorts of support here regardless of our nomenclature and that we explain our nomenclature clearly.

Carlton Samuels: That is correct.

Alan Greenberg: Other than that's let not revisit - let's not revisit the definitions right now; I think we have better things to do with our time.

Carlton Samuels: And that's - thank you, Alan - that's correct. We're not going to back in there. I think Cheryl just made that point and I think it is useful for us to have it properly explained in the section. That I agree with.

Eric, you had an idea that - for the explanation that I see you put in the chat. Would you like to say something?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure. For the transcript record this is Eric Brunner-Williams. I don't know when or where the change of nomenclature from in kind support to nonfinancial support was proposed, who proposed or when this was consented to.

It changes the scope of a conceptualization which is possibly a problem. But certainly means that what an area that had been outside the scope of the subgroup on in kind, that is things which do not arise from a vendor or a third party, are - have actually not been investigated by any particular subgroup; they've been ignored and the assumption that this was not in kind and that in kind would not be redefined or repurposed to mean anything that wasn't financial.

So I am concerned about the process that leads to a change in the conceptualization and to what looks like a housekeeping problem.
Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Eric. Just let me say that the - the proposal for tying down the wording we use for certain things made on numerous occasion, a list was actually developed and put to the list, persons were asked to make their comments...

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm sorry, Carlton, are you telling me that because there was (unintelligible) in tying down language that the - that substantial changes have been made?

Carlton Samuels: No that's more than that. You asked - you don't know when. I'm responding to your question was you don't know when. I am trying to locate in kind for you when that happened. That happened...

Eric Brunner-Williams: So as the chair you're telling me it was a consensus decision to change this substantially so that things which we have ignored are now...

Carlton Samuels: This is...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: This is the case. This is the case. This is the case, Eric. The way it works is the question is asked both places...

Eric Brunner-Williams: No, Carlton, the way it works is that there's a consensus call. And if there isn't consensus there isn't consensus. I don't consent to changing the term from in kind support to anything else. Not because I'm opposed to...

Carlton Samuels: I am glad to hear that, Eric, no but...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...the time for you to talk would have been when it was proposed. And silence in our context means consent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Whoa, hang on a minute.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Carlton, you are mistaken. And you are not the working group.

Carlton Samuels: I am afraid we are going back to issues that were put in for quite some time. I'm afraid we are going back to a discussion that there was opportunities for many weeks to make this available. And that's where I stand. Alan, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. My recollection - and it may be faulted - is there was vehement opposition to using the term in kind support from at least one and perhaps more people. And a suggestion was made to use what we're using right now. And I believe there was no vehement opposition to that at that time. And therefore it entered the draft.

Carlton Samuels: That is exactly how it happened, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's my recollection.

Carlton Samuels: That is more than a recollection so that...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...so those are the facts of the case.

Alan Greenberg: Whether that's a formal consensus call or not is a - I won't go into.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. That is not a definition of consensus; it's a definition of lack of objection. And that may have been when we have a list of terms here either bandwidth issues or genuine agreement. But let's not get into that.

What I was calling for is if the terminology has changed and there are two terms which are used - which are meaning the same thing the first

time we used them in the documentation can we make sure that we make sure everyone who reads the documentation understands what it is. In terms of process that's the whole other (format).

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. That's what I am suggesting to the writers that we put the meaning and context by offering some illuminating comment on the use of the term nonfinancial.

Eric, you have the floor.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript record. As the subgroup tasked with in kind support was tasked only with in kind support the change in term from in kind support to anything else suggests to the ultimate consumer of our work product, the board, via the supporting organizations, that in fact a different scope was investigated by the working group than in fact occurred. This must be noted. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Will anyone offer a comment on the content that says - begins the following are the nonfinancial types of support proposed to ICANN?

Yes, Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Assuming that I'm not just looking at the least (unintelligible) this list will be and the surrounding text that I'm looking at in the notes section would be the text that we would be having in the final report a (unintelligible) explanatory parenthetical that says not in - that says something along the lines of including but not limited to maybe some use to consider. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Would anyone care to offer another suggestion about how you make sure people understand that the kinds of in kind support proposed to ICANN and embrace all of them that we can envision it wherever they come from by whatever means. Was there another suggestion to ensure that when we use the term nonfinancial types of support all of these are embraced?

Cheryl, you have your hand up again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, yes. I mean, the list is the list is the list. The list has been discussed. The list has been agreed to. The list is as good as the current set of work group members on this call can build upon based on the wider group of workgroup members who have contributed to it.

But it is not necessarily exhaustive. It is not limited to only and it is I guess not necessarily each and every one of them; that it may be some of them or none of them in some cases. And all I'm suggesting is that some form of sentence somewhere in the final documentation should make sure that that's what it's - yes, that's clearly understood by the reader.

It's an extensive but still indicative of the types of. Beyond that I think we'd be overworking it.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. So for the record where we have the verbiage begin, and the following are nonfinancial types, we are proposing that there is a note that goes there that says this is non-exhaustive, etcetera, etcetera; words to that effect.

Can we go now to the portion that begins support from third parties facilitated by ICANN - facilitated by ICANN?

Alan, you have your hand up, sir, you have the floor. Alan maybe you're muted; you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, I was muted. Yes I think we need to carefully define what facilitated by ICANN means. I take it to mean that ICANN is acting as a go-between, a collector of people who want to offer it and people who need it. But I think we need to carefully define it here. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. So noted. That is what I think it meant in this context but your point is well taken; we should have a broader scope definition of what it means, I agree.

Alan Greenberg: We have dead air on my side.

Carlton Samuels: We have dead air on my side too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) plenty of dead air in today's call so let's hope the (unintelligible) stop being involved. After all we got all that good press last time.

Carlton Samuels: Cheryl, I don't know, it's very difficult to hear you all of a sudden. I don't know it's so if you're hearing us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm hearing you fine. And as I said to Wendy I am now talking into a plain old telephone service speaker which yes is tucked

under my chin. If I put my high quality headset on you all know what will happen.

Carlton Samuels: I'm hearing you now, my dear. I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's me waking the family...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I understand that.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...speaking to you.

Carlton Samuels: Point well taken. Okay can I ask a question? You notice the section on IPv6; there's quite an interesting (oggy-boggy) back and forth on IPv6. I think one of the folks on the registry/registrar constituency was particularly seized of this issue.

Can I ask the company here if the - this content captures what we want to say and take into account some of the concerns that have been raised?

Alan Greenberg: Carlton, it's Alan, who raised the concerns?

Carlton Samuels: On the list there were concerns which Neylon and a couple others and Eric was involved in that conversation very deep conversation with them.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm suggesting those who raised the concerns should be the ones to comment on whether they're now relieved or not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Olivier also - Cheryl here for the record...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...was contributory to the discussion...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...so we have two of the tripartite. I'm sure we can hear from them.

Carlton Samuels: Thanks, Cheryl. That is in fact truth; Olivier was a part of that intense discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Carlton. I popped my hand up but...

Carlton Samuels: I was just about to recognize you, Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For the transcript record Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Olivier basically said he didn't have much to add to it. That's fine but we do need to answer the question. For the record I recognize in the note text here, the following quote, "While the GAC has requested that the IPv(5) be eliminated for JAS..." And that should all be capitalized, "...qualified participants," or we should be looking at the new nomenclature not JAS nomenclature. We seem to be mixing apples and oranges which I assume Seth with his checking of text will harmonize later. That was an aside, by the way.

That - our text goes on to say, "This will be a difficult political decision for the ICANN Board to make yet solving the IPv6 problem is critical since the IPv6 requirement as it stands would need all new registries in developing countries would either need to rely on incumbent registries in the developed region or would need to find some way to establish a title to IPv6 access on their own." And it goes on.

I think a number of us would - and certainly a number of us within the At Large community would have very particular views on these comments that will not be unlinked so they will be definitely linked to the views of organizations and aspirations of organizations that we are involved with that may be perhaps outside of ICANN.

Some of those may be commercially and/or open source service provisions motivated and some of them may have caused (unintelligible) things like Internet Society principal motivated.

I think that statement does stand on its own but we probably need to have some footnoting done. There are an awful lot of tunnel opportunities which may or may not be commercially driven ones which would perhaps expand some of the potential discussion that would come out of that second part of that sentence.

So it's just one of those topics that I think perhaps we need to footnote. I don't think it's part of the workgroup's job to solve this problem; if it is indeed even a problem. I do think it needs to be recognized in the report. I think it's one of those points where whilst the GAC would suggest it should be put in the too hard basket.

There are many people, myself in a personal capacity included, but also my Internet Society chapter that I represent within the At Large community would be of a similar mind that would want the IPv6 issue to not be swept aside but indeed be addressed and stay as a requirement. And that would see tunneling as a not too unreasonable or insurmountable task to be expecting.

And the access on their own would be as complicated as sending them a CD. I've got several hundred I could send any number of people for example. So that's the type of stuff that I think rather than us have people start those debates all over the world if we were to put in some footnoting and resourcing and whatever would probably keep our noses clean on the topic.

But I see a list has generated and I'll put my hand down. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl, for that. It probably created the space of us to join in and I'm happy for that. Olivier, you have the floor, sir, and then Avri and Alan after.

Olivier Cr pin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Can you hear me?

Carlton Samuels: Yes I hear you perfectly fine.

Olivier Cr pin-Leblond: Okay thank you. Olivier for the transcript record. I guess that Cheryl has already launched into a long description which I agree with. And one of the reasons why I didn't want to say any further - any earlier - a little bit earlier was because I think we've discussed this for a very long time and it's a religious thing.

The IPv4 IPv6 subject is religious. Some will be vehemently against IPv6 because it is expensive to implement and apparently - and this is what I'm told - some countries have great problems with being able to access IPv6 because there is no local native IPv6 Internet service provider.

However of course as we've all discussed in the past there are tunneling services that are available, there are ways to get around it. And then one looks at the complexity and added potential costs for that added complexity.

And again I think that we are spending too much time on the subject because ultimately IPv6 is what everyone is going to have to move to. And I think it would be doing a disservice to those countries with needy applicants to not feel the pressure to move to IPv6.

I'm in two minds about this of course because it's a bit more expensive at the moment and might be more complex for them. But at the same time in my job outside of ICANN I sell equipment to various countries in Africa and I have seen there is great dynamism in those developing countries and developing economies for IPv6 to be implemented and for people to learn about it.

So I think having a footnote with the explanation that ICANN would possibly help out or facilitate support for IPv6 providers to provide IPv6 gateways or facilitate for tunneling this sort of thing is the most that we have to add on this. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Just to go slightly beyond I do believe it's a reasonable thing for the nonfinancial aid thing to concentrate. I am one of those that is dead set against it as a requirement. I am also totally aware that the religious powers that be inside ICANN have deemed it is so so it must be so. And I can hit my head against the wall as much as I want; it will remain so.

And people will object. I think I take - I think I take very well people like Michele's suggestion that there's providers of plenty out there that will provide it. So therefore I think it should be on the list of things that we're looking for, these providers of plenty, to, you know, come and say we will help with this service. Yes.

Now what we do if they don't come about I don't know. I'm taking it that Michele knows what he's talking about and that indeed there are plenty of people out there that will, for free, give some sort of barely adequate IPv6 tunneling to any applicant from - support qualified applicant that needs it.

So I think it should be a key part of the thing. And perhaps it does need a footnote that because it is an absolute requirement of the application process and because we do not believe that we can get this thing withdrawn for support applicants that if there are no offerer of the service it needs to be resurrected.

The other problem I had that I wrote about when I wrote my contribution which was to say that we need to be sure that ICANN and the evaluators accept the existence of willing providers of tunnels as an answer.

So when indeed - so when a support applicant - support-qualified applicant, an SQA, comes and fulfills - puts in their application and they say I will get my IPv6 through one of the nonfinancial contributors of the applicant support program that is a good enough answer.
Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri. Alan, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Alan Greenberg. I'll point out this thing is under things facilitated by ICANN. So...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...I'd like to think that if ICANN is acting as the facilitator it won't then reject anyone who uses these services. Perhaps I'm being picky in raising that. I would prefer not to see this - the explicit (the) solution that's on the last line of the chat right now or at least last line on mine of referring to ASO and RARs.

I think there's plenty of alternatives which don't need that level of approval to do it. There presumably are volunteers or ICANN needs to find some people who are willing to volunteer it or make it available at such a modest price that the price is not an issue - I don't think we really care which it is - and leave it at that.

I mean, I agree - the GAC request is not going to be honored; that's reality. Then let's make sure ICANN understands that there is - it does have a responsibility to make sure those without IPv6 access can still provide an application. That's it. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. Can I then just ask you, Alan, just for clarification for the record, that you're suggesting that in the note we put here we make that clarifying statement that it is - if it is going to be facilitated we would expect ICANN to make whatever arrangement is necessary to meet the condition for IPv6?

Alan Greenberg: That's not exactly the words I would use. I can refine the words when we see the draft but, yes. And it's under the section of facilitated by ICANN. We're already saying...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...that by the definition. By placement rather.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan, that's exactly what I wanted you to say. Thank you very much. Olivier, you have the floor, sir. Olivier, you might be muted.

Olivier Cr pin-Leblond: I'm sorry, my hand was up I put it back down.

Carlton Samuels: Oh okay. Okay. Now there is a - working through the document you get the point where you say - the question is so should these services be made available? And I suppose the objective of this portion of the text is to indicate a kind of pseudo process.

And by the way I'm saying this because - I'll come to you in a minute, Eric. We are going to discuss the process itself. And we've circulated the process mapping that was done with (Devon), the staff. And I'm going to make a final comment later on about that.

Eric, you have the floor. Eric, you may be muted. Eric, you have your hand up; you have the floor, sir.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Here.

Carlton Samuels: You're coming in faintly now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Great, thank you very much. Can you hear me now?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I'm hearing you. I hope everybody else is.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, me too. I can't actually find the text that's been discussed for the past 10 minutes and I've been looking for the past 10 minutes. So I would appreciate URL to it so that I can actually see the text which - from which excerpts have been read.

Alan Greenberg: Are you on Adobe?

Carlton Samuels: Are you on Adobe, Eric? You are, you've been typing.

Alan Greenberg: Okay it's right in the middle of the note screen.

Carlton Samuels: It's in the note screen and we're working our way through.

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: You know, when I used that URL - oh slide down the note screen; somewhere in the middle. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. Just following on from - I am assuming that when I work from the notes screen text I'm working unless it's clearly annotation or comment from cut and paste of the current draft of our report text?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes, Cheryl, that's what it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Okay, in which case the URLs that are referenced ought to be taking us to those texts. So maybe we just need to double check that there's not a broken link somewhere in the system. Not now but in the (unintelligible) time. I know there's a lot of page changes that have recently happened so maybe something got misconnected.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, the last link was sent to the list by Seth as late as this morning. And when I checked on it it actually went to the screen. So I'm not sure - that's why I mentioned in the beginning that you can get the full text and where you could get the full text in three different formats. So, yes, thanks for asking the clarification.

Any other comments? Most of you would have seen Karla's - if you haven't - in the housekeeping email that Karla sent out before she left. She gave an update as to what's happening with the Web pages that they're setting up for listing all of these services and explanatory notes for it. It is part of the recommendation. I hope you've seen the email.

And if you have any comments that could help move this in the direction that we all wish to have it make it on the list or even better yet you can make a comment if you think the comment is going to illuminate anything that is in this report please make the comment in the comment's page on the wiki.

Eric, you have your hand up, sir. You have the floor.

Eric Brunner-Williams: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Can't hear you.

Carlton Samuels: You're - thank you, Alan. No, can't hear you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, I'll try again. Can you hear me now?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, sir. We're hearing you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Good. I'd like to know as a matter of housekeeping who wrote the text (unintelligible) the paragraph...

Carlton Samuels: Eric, I can't hear a word after the first line. You're breaking up for some reason.

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...that we have been discussing. Does anyone know?

Carlton Samuels: I didn't hear the question, Eric.

Alan Greenberg: Are you asking who drafted the text?

Eric Brunner-Williams: That's correct, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I assume Seth who's doing the writing of this document either took it from somewhere or drafted it. Maybe Seth can confirm.

Carlton Samuels: Seth didn't draft it; it was a draft that was prepared by Elaine and the team and additions from conversations. That was placed in the candidate text area which is where Seth cut and pasted from.

Alan Greenberg: That's what I just said I think.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We have dead air again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm going to start humming just to keep the entertainment quotient going.

Alan Greenberg: You sure that's going to be entertainment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well snoring was.

Alan Greenberg: I can sing; that would cut the call short quickly.

Carlton Samuels: Well that's the - that's the second - that's the final piece in this area. Seth has asked for a little confab with a few members of the team.

Could I ask Avri, Alan, Cheryl if you could spend five more minute after the call is concluded...

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: ...and stay on? Most appreciated.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Olivier, are you available, sir? If you could indicate if you could...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, I am...

Carlton Samuels: ...stay on?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I am indeed, yes. That's no problem. It's just that it takes me a while to unmute before - it takes a couple of seconds.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Avri, do I have your agreement?

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, I had already unmuted and said yes but I guess you didn't hear me. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I herd her say it three times now.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes well I think it might even be four but, yes, yes and yes again.

Carlton Samuels: All right great. Okay so this - we seem to have run out of conversation on this topic here. And that being the case I'm going to call this conference officially over.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you all. We are going to close off the official portion of this call for - that reported and for the record. So we will switch off the recording right now. See you all next week.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do we need to stay in the AC room or not?

Carlton Samuels: We're on the - we don't need the AC room I don't think but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I'm asking because Seth may want to put up text for me to look at or something, I mean...

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...what the hell am I doing and why am I hear is I guess...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Seth...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: While I'm here do I need to look at any form of text and will it be shared through the...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: I don't know. I don't know, Cheryl. Let me...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Seth could answer me, Carlton. Seth?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What the hell do you want me for, Seth?

Seth Green: Hi, Cheryl. I want you or many, many reasons but no you do not need the AC room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I shall now get out of the AC room and...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...with audio.

Seth Green: Thank you, Cheryl.

Glen de Saint Géry: This is Glen. Would you like to stay on this same call, Seth?

Seth Green: Is that possible, Glen? Maybe just to...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes it is. I'll just take that up with the operator. Just gibe me one second to make sure that she's put the recording off. All right?

Seth Green: Thank you very much, Glen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now you gab...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: (Debra)...

END